

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 17 and 29 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, claim 92 is added, and claims 7, 18, 20, 30, 34, 42, 54, 55, 56, and 73 have been amended. Accordingly, claims 2-16, 18, 20-28, 30-32, 34-89, and 92 are pending and under consideration.

Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. §102 and §103

The Office Action rejects claims 2-11, 20-25, 34-39, 46-51, 56-64, 67-70, 73-81, 84-87 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,621,429 issued to Yamaashi et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Yamaashi"). In addition, the Office Action also rejects claims 12-18, 26-32, 40-45, 52, 53, 65, 66, 71, 72, 82, 83, 88, and 89 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamaashi in view of the Background of the Invention of the present application. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Yamaashi

Yamaashi does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least, "said apparatus further comprises a set-top-box and said target device comprises a digital television set," as recited in claim 7.

Claims 2-6 and 8-11 depend from claim 7 and include all of the features of claim 7. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claims 2-6 and 8-11 are also patentably distinguishable from Yamaashi.

Yamaashi does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least, "wherein said apparatus comprises a digital television set and said source comprises a set-top-box," as recited in claim 20.

Claims 21-25 depend from claim 20 and include all of the features of claim 20. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claims 21-25 are also patentably distinguishable from Yamaashi.

Yamaashi does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least, "wherein said source comprises a set-top-box digital television and said target comprises a digital television set," as recited in claim 34.

Claims 35-39 and 46-51 depend from claim 34 and include all of the features of claim 34. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claims 35-39 and 46-51 are also patentably distinguishable from Yamaashi.

Yamaashi does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least, "wherein said source comprises a set-top-box digital television and said target comprises a digital television set," as recited in claims 56 and 73.

Claims 57-64 and 67-70 depend from claim 56 and include all of the features of claim 56. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claims 57-64 and 67-70 are also patentably distinguishable from Yamaashi.

Claims 74-81 and 84-87 depend from claim 73 and include all of the features of claim 73. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claims 74-81 and 84-87 are also patentably distinguishable from Yamaashi.

Yamaashi and Background of the Invention of the present application

Because Yamaashi does not disclose the above features, the Office Action asserts that one having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the Background of the present invention with Yamaashi. This assertion is respectfully traversed.

Applicant respectfully submits that one having ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to combine Yamaashi with the Background of the present application. Yamaashi does not refer to any communications between a digital television and set-top box. Instead, as shown in Figure 4B or discussed in col. 1, lines 5-15, Yamaashi is applied to a computer system coupled to a computer network. Because Yamaashi refers to displaying in windows information supplied by a computer network (i.e., computer network application) instead of communication between a digital set-top box and a digital television, one having ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to combine Yamaashi with the Background of the present application.

In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that Yamaashi and the Background of the present invention, taken separately or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest at least, "sending, from said source to said target, a query to receive said information, and sending said information from said target to said source," as recited in claims 58 and 75.

Further, Applicant respectfully submits that Yamaashi and the Background of the present invention, taken separately or in combination, does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least, "said controller periodically receives from said target device information comprising at least one of display capabilities and display features of said target device," as recited in claim 92 (at least paragraph [0047] of the specification provides support for this new claim).

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Objection to Claims 54 and 55

In item 6, the Office Action objects to claims 54 and 55 as being dependent upon rejected base claim 34. Applicant rewrites claims 54 and 55 in independent form. Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Summary

Claims 2-16, 18, 20-28, 30-32, 34-89, and 92 are pending and under consideration. It is respectfully submitted that none of the references taken alone or in combination disclose the present claimed invention.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date:

January 19, 2006

By:

Paul F. Daebeler

Paul F. Daebeler

Registration No. 35,852

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501